

Congress of the United States

Washington, DC 20515

June 7, 2018

The Honorable Scott Pruitt
Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dear Administrator Pruitt:

We write to express grave concerns about the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) proposed rule, published on April 30, 2018, titled Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science (Docket No. EPA-HQ-OA-2018-0259). Contrary to its name, the proposed rule would implement an opaque process allowing EPA to selectively suppress scientific evidence without accountability and in the process undermine bedrock environmental laws. We join nearly a thousand scientists^[1] and many leading scientific organizations^[2] in opposing this policy and urge you to withdraw the proposed rule.

The proposed rule suffers from significant procedural flaws including lack of supporting evidence, insufficient detail in the proposal itself, and conflicts with EPA's statutory obligations. The substance of the rule is also concerning. It appears to be targeted at excluding important public health studies while privileging industry-sponsored research. It also fails to adequately consider the costs of implementation and the potential privacy implications. Finally, the discretion it grants the Administrator to grant case-by-case exemptions completely undermines the stated goal of transparency.

Without any significant evidence supporting it, the proposed rule is a solution in search of a problem. The proposed rule fails to identify specific weaknesses in EPA's current scientific approach, which is grounded in peer review. Wendy Wagner, author of two of the studies EPA cites to rationalize the rule, said in response to the proposed rule: "They don't adopt any of our recommendations, and they go in a direction that's completely opposite, completely different."^[3] The proposed rule also invokes policies from *Nature*, *Science*, and the *Proceedings of the National Academies of Science*, but each of these organizations has argued against the rule.^[4] Additionally, EPA fails to cite any specific language providing authority for the rule and asks commenters where the authority may be found. Key issues including how data would be made available to the public and how private information would be protected are not addressed. This is a serious deficiency in a rule meant to increase access to data for the public.

^[1] <https://s3.amazonaws.com/ucs-documents/science-and-democracy/secret-science-letter-4-23-2018.pdf>

^[2] <https://blog.ucsusa.org/michael-halpern/a-list-of-scientific-organizations-that-have-supported-and-opposed-limiting-what-research-epa-can-use-to-make-decisions>

^[3] <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2018/04/how-the-epas-new-secret-science-rule/558878/>

^[4] <https://www.aaas.org/news/scientific-leaders-speak-out-epa-s-proposed-transparency-rule>

The proposed rule is inconsistent with EPA's statutory obligations to ground its actions on scientific evidence. The Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) and the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) require that EPA use the "best available science." Courts have found this language to require that agencies "seek out and consider all existing scientific evidence" and not ignore existing data.^[5] This standard would be impossible to meet under the proposed rule.

The proposed rule requires that data underlying EPA's regulatory actions be made publicly available to allow for independent validation. Such a standard could exclude studies that utilize confidential industry and health data that are vital to understanding the nature of chemical pollutants, the impacts of pollution, and the most effective ways to protect the environment and public health. One such piece of health research is the "Six Cities" study,^[6] which followed more than 8,000 participants for nearly twenty years and was key in establishing a link between chronic air pollution exposure and increased mortality. The results of this study have stood up to extensive subsequent analysis, highlighting the strength of such research.^[7] This is just one example of an entire class of studies that the rule would remove from consideration. Excluding such health studies would hobble EPA's ability to implement laws like the Clean Air Act, SDWA, and TSCA and to fulfill its mission to protect public health and the environment.

Attempting to comply with the publication requirement and health privacy laws would place enormous burdens on EPA and researchers. According to an internal EPA analysis of the HONEST Act, which had a similar data-publishing requirement, the EPA would have to spend more than \$250 million annually to redact private health information before releasing study data to the public.^[8] EPA failed to provide a cost-benefit analysis of the proposed rule, only stating that EPA shall implement the provisions "in a manner that minimizes cost." Even with careful redaction, there is still a possibility of study participants being identified due to the amount of information that would have to be revealed under the proposed rule for the purposes of reproducibility. The rule is costly and a threat to the privacy of Americans.

Concerns with the proposed rule are not limited to the public health community. Dr. Nancy Beck, Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention, has expressed reservations about the publishing requirements of the proposed rule for industry as well.^[9] Industry representatives have expressed concerns about requiring public disclosure of data, such as Confidential Business Information, citing the potential for improper use of such data by competitors.^[10]

In addition, the proposal to allow the EPA Administrator to grant exemptions on a case-by-case basis would enable the Administrator to interfere in the rulemaking process in an arbitrary and capricious manner. The Administrator is not required to present the reasoning behind such

^[5] *Ecology Ctr., Inc. v U.S. Forest Serv.*, 451 F.3d 1183, 1194 n.4 (10th Cir. 2006)

^[6] *Dockery et al.* 1993. *An association between and mortality in six U.S. cities.* *New England J. Med.* 329:1753-1759. doi: 10.1056/NEJM199312093292401.

^[7] <https://www.healtheffects.org/system/files/Reanalysis-ExecSumm.pdf>

^[8] <https://www.ucsusa.org/center-science-and-democracy/attacks-on-science/administrator-pruitt-ignores-epa-staff-analysis#.WujH-KQvxaR>

^[9] <http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2018/04/trump-s-epa-wants-stamp-out-secret-science-internal-emails-show-it-harder-expected>

^[10] <https://www.bna.com/pesticide-makers-back-n57982091585/>


decisions. This waiver provision establishes an opaque process, completely at odds with the stated purpose of the rule, that would bring additional uncertainty to the regulatory process.

We support transparency and scientific integrity. However, the proposed rule will limit transparency and undermine the scientific integrity of EPA's rulemaking process. Given its numerous flaws and the lack of an underlying rationale, we urge you to withdraw the proposed rule.


Sincerely,




Diana DeGette
Member of Congress



Donald S. Beyer Jr.
Member of Congress



Paul Tonko
Member of Congress



Daniel W. Lipinski
Member of Congress



Mark DeSaulnier
Member of Congress



Debbie Dingell
Member of Congress




Alan Lowenthal
Member of Congress




Donald M. Payne, Jr.
Member of Congress




Salud O. Carbajal
Member of Congress



Elizabeth H. Esty
Member of Congress




Kathleen M. Rice
Member of Congress




Ted W. Lieu
Member of Congress



Colleen Hanabusa
Member of Congress




Mike Doyle
Member of Congress




Anna G. Eshoo
Member of Congress




A. Donald McEachin
Member of Congress




Pramila Jayapal
Member of Congress




Ryan Costello
Member of Congress




John Lewis
Member of Congress




Jacky Rosen
Member of Congress




Charlie Crist
Member of Congress



Jamie Raskin
Member of Congress



Joseph P. Kennedy, III
Member of Congress




James P. McGovern
Member of Congress



Suzanne Bonamici
Member of Congress




Ro Khanna
Member of Congress



Brian Fitzpatrick
Member of Congress




Raja Krishnamoorthi
Member of Congress



Matt Cartwright
Member of Congress



Earl Blumenauer
Member of Congress



Debbie Wasserman Schultz
Member of Congress



Scott H. Peters
Member of Congress




Tim Ryan
Member of Congress




Brendan F. Boyle
Member of Congress



Susan A. Davis
Member of Congress



Ruben Gallego
Member of Congress




Bill Foster
Member of Congress




Raul Ruiz
Member of Congress




Nanette Diaz Barragán
Member of Congress




Zoe Lofgren
Member of Congress




Carlos Curbelo
Member of Congress



Jared Huffman
Member of Congress




Seth Moulton
Member of Congress



Ed Perlmutter
Member of Congress




Michael Capuano
Member of Congress



Mark Pocan
Member of Congress



Darren Soto
Member of Congress



Tulsi Gabbard
Member of Congress




Anthony Brown
Member of Congress




Mark Takano
Member of Congress



Tony Cárdenas
Member of Congress




Raul M. Grijalva
Member of Congress



Derek Kilmer
Member of Congress




Carol Shea-Porter
Member of Congress



Niki Tsongas
Member of Congress




Adriano Espaillat
Member of Congress



John K. Delaney
Member of Congress




Jared Polis
Member of Congress




Robert A. Brady
Member of Congress





Kathy Castor
Member of Congress



Yvette D. Clarke
Member of Congress



G. Butterfield
Member of Congress



Lucille Roybal-Allard
Member of Congress



David E. Price
Member of Congress



Ferrol Nadler
Member of Congress



Rick Larsen
Member of Congress


Peter A. DeFazio
Member of Congress


Eleanor Holmes Norton
Member of Congress



Chellie Pingree
Member of Congress



Marcy Kaptel
Member of Congress



Sheila Jackson Lee
Member of Congress



Bobby L. Rush
Member of Congress



Illeana Ros-Lehtinen
Member of Congress



Gerald E. Connolly
Member of Congress



Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr.
Member of Congress



Karen Bass
Member of Congress



Keith Ellison
Member of Congress



Betty McCollum
Member of Congress



Jerry McNerney
Member of Congress



Barbara Lee
Member of Congress



Nydia M. Velázquez
Member of Congress



Peter Welch
Member of Congress



Doris Matsui
Member of Congress


Emanuel Cleaver
Member of Congress



William R. Keating
Member of Congress



José E. Serrano
Member of Congress



Jan Schakowsky
Member of Congress



Steve Cohen
Member of Congress



Adam B. Schiff
Member of Congress



Rosa DeLauro
Member of Congress



Wm. Lacy Clay
Member of Congress



John Garamendi
Member of Congress



John Sarbanes
Member of Congress



Frederica S. Wilson
Member of Congress



Ben Ray Luján
Member of Congress



Mike Quigley
Member of Congress



Brian Higgins
Member of Congress



Eliot L. Engel
Member of Congress


Dina Titus
Member of Congress


Jackie Speier
Member of Congress


Gene Green
Member of Congress


Conor Lamb
Member of Congress


Ami Bera, M.D.
Member of Congress

